DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 103 867 CS 201 927

AUTHOR Stern, Frederick C.
TITLE Miller v. Smitherman; Smitherman v. Miller: The Case for the Composition Cafeteria.
PUB DATE Mar 75
NOTE 24p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the Conference on College Composition and Communication (26th, St. Louis, March 13-15, 1975)

EDRS PRICE MF-$0.76 HC-$1.58 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS *Composition (Literary); Educational Methods; *Educational Objectives; *Educational Philosophy; *Educational Programs; Higher Education; Social Differences; *Teaching Methods
IDENTIFIERS Miller (James E); Smitherman (Geneva)

ABSTRACT

Colleges should implement cafeteria composition (a widely varied program of composition) in order to acknowledge the huge variety of educational needs, educational objectives, and socially useful functions to which colleges must respond. As a prelude to this argument, the educational philosophies of Miller and Smitherman may be reviewed. Miller considers composition courses to be an incentive for student creativity, but Smitherman, without rejecting aesthetic concern for language, sees composition courses as a service designed primarily to help students do their work in other college courses more competently. Cafeteria composition incorporates both of these educational objectives by making available to students a variety of courses taught by a variety of teachers with different approaches and styles. (TS)

ED103867

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

Frederick C. Stern
Department of English
University of Illinois at
Chicago Circle
Box 4348
Chicago, Illinois 60680

Miller v. Smitherman; Smitherman v. Miller: The Case for the Composition Cafeteria

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
Frederick C. Stern
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

by

Frederick C. Stern

At the CCCC meeting in New Orleans in 1973, Prof. James E. Miller, Jr. of the Department of English at the University of Chicago delivered an address entitled "Rediscovering the Rhetoric of Imagination," in which he advocates as a main goal for the teaching of composition, what we can call "the classroom of creativity." Says Miller: "There is nothing of correction here, but much of liberation, much that might lead naturally to the natural use of language symbolically and creatively....we can turn composition into a process of exploration and discovery--a genuine rhetoric of imagination." [1]

At the CCCC meeting in Anaheim in 1974, Prof. Geneva Smitherman of the Center for Black Studies at Wayne State University, delivered an address entitled "Hidden Agendas: The View from Minority Students Or 'Keep This Nigger Boy Runnin'," in which she articulated quite another purpose for the teaching of composition, at least for

CS 201 927

minority students, than does Miller, an approach we can call "the classroom of survival." She says:

> ...I am not unmindful of the theory held by some that writing should be a "liberating activity," a consciousness building thing, but writing as therapy just ain the Black student's Thang. His "T-Group" done been the Oral Tradition that is embodied in the rap session at the crib or on the corner. And he got his Black Consciousness Thang together back in the Sixties; now he wants to be able to deal on the society/system with his new sense of self. So unlike the uptight, "uptaught" student, he is pretty much in touch with himself and free of the psychological hang-ups of the white, middle class student. BUT he is still enslaved in other important ways: this Black student is looking for political and economic liberation and perceives his university credentials as a step toward the goal of liberation. Thus he is likely to dismiss as irrelevant composition teaching not geared towards equipping him with the necessaries for his university survival kit. [2]

These two statements are representative of two important points of view abroad in our profession about the whys--and, consequently, the hows--of composition teaching. Must we choose one or the other as an ideology for our composition classroom? Are they mutually exclusive? Must we choose between creation and survival? My own

bent is always to seek a possible unity of opposites. Perhaps we can do so here, after examining the two positions presented. Miller v. Smitherman, then--or Smitherman v. Miller, if you prefer, as I am not at all certain who, if anyone, is the plaintiff and who the defendant in this case.

I have had the pleasure of being taught by James E. Miller, Jr., and I can clearly see the connection between the way he teaches a graduate seminar on Melville and the way he approaches problems of composition. His sources are deeply philosophical, his concern is the very working of the artistic imagination, and the uses of the imagination not only by the artist, but by the audience as well. Thus, his paper on composition is sprinkled with quotations from the Pisan Cantos, from Wallace Stevens and from Margaret Mead; his "ideology of composition" derives from Susanne Langer's conception of language as primarily symbolic rather than communicative, and from Noam Chomsky's conception of "natural language," that amazing innate ability of every human being to produce meaningful utterances. From such sources, Miller extrapolates "the classroom of creation." He conceives it the function of the composition teacher to do much more than to teach language as a skill, or language as a means of communicating messages. Indeed, he relegates these tasks of language to secondary and rather mundane places, and emphasizes quite another role for language, and hence for the language teacher. He says: "...we encounter (on the one hand) the view of language as a means of thought, ultimately 'legitimate' only in the service of an austere logic or (on the other hand), the view of language as a

means of communication, of signalling messages from one person to another (or to many) with concision and precision....What else can language do? The answer, I think, is--almost everything....We must begin to understand that the essence of language lies not in logic, but in symbolism; that the end of language is best comprehended not as communication, but as creation.

It is because of this view of language that Miller rejects the "classroom of correction," and also because of these views that he rejects behaviorist approaches to composition teaching, which would lead us, he says, here quoting Chomsky, to "...'reconstruct curriculum in the terms defined by the new technology. And it is not too difficult'," Miller continues to quote Chomsky approvingly," 'to invent a rationale, making use of the concepts of "controlling behavior," enhancing skills, and so on. Nor is it difficult to construct objective tests that are sure to demonstrate that an important educational goal has been achieved. They will not demonstrate that it is important to concentrate on developing skilled behavior in the student. What little we know about human intelligence would at least suggest something quite different: that by diminishing the range and complexity of materials presented to the inquiring mind, by setting behavior in fixed patterns, these methods may harm and distort the normal development of creative abilities'." [3]

It is then in part on the basis of his rejection of behaviorism that Miller rejects the "classroom of correction," and opts for the "classroom of creation." While not very specific in recommending a

procedure for the teacher in such a classroom (although in his text, World, Self, Reality: The Rhetoric of Imagination,[4] we can see his approach in action), and while, in fact, he says that "...the creative classroom can never be brought into being by formulas or prescription," Miller does tell us what he sees as the primary task of the teacher in the "classroom of creation." "In a truly creative classroom," he says, "the teacher's primary aim will be to help the student to discover what he already knows....the composition teacher...should come to realize that the student has mastered in every day life an amazingly sophisticated rhetoric and has lived intimately in and through language in its fundamentally symbolic and creative sense. The creative classroom should be a place of exploration and discovery for both the teacher and the student of what the student knows, and should provide experiences for freeing and extending, liberating and elaborating this knowledge."

As is the case in Miller's statement, the sources of Smitherman's ideology of composition are quite clear and explicit. Though I have not had the pleasure of being formally taught by her, brief conversation at Anaheim makes apparent her deep and abiding concerns with the future for Black students and for other minority students in the University, her fundamentally political approach to language-teaching as a tool for and a means towards liberation from racist oppression, and for coming to terms with, if not undoing, a repressive social system. Where Miller cites Pound and Stevens and Mead, Smitherman cites the story of a Black linguist, Ernie Smith,

who, she says, "...used to be known as 'Sweet Ernie' in his old hustlin days in the streets!" By telling his story as a Black student in the public schools almost--but not quite--suffocated by the "classroom of correction," and by alluding to Geneva Smitherman's own experiences in the same institutions and in the Universities, she too rejects the "classroom of correction." She further asserts that such a classroom is no mere vestige of the past.

From a concern about racism in American University life, from experiences as a Black person in white racist America, on the basis of what she describes as "my ongoing research in this area," she concludes that "...students of this generation bees going through the same ol changes that Ernie and I went through." She rejects the classroom of correction not only because it fails to teach, confuses the student, and undermines the student's confidence, but also because it enhances the Black student's sense of inferiority. "/E/ven though the message of linguistic inferiority is not stated explicitly," she says, "it comes across through implication--via instructions, assignments, grading procedures, and so on."

Rejecting, then, the "classroom of correction," and especially rejecting it when it derives from a standard based on purely white-determined norms, Smitherman sets forth what seems to me to be at the core of her "ideology of composition." She cites as example the work at Black-run Nairobi College at Palo Alto, where the watchword is "excellence," and says: "The Excellence model asserts that Blacks and other minorities can excel in cognitive/linguistic

tasks and teaches towards the acquisition of that Excellence. Specifically in language/composition teaching, this bees meanin that we by-pass the petty talk about whether students bees sayin he do or he does, and instead we set up a learning environment whereby he gains mastery in higher order conceptual skills and the ability to articulate his thoughts logically, coherently, with specificity, and WITH WHATEVER NUTS AND BOLTS OF DIALECT HE HAS AT HIS COMMAND."

It seems to me that the issue in Smitherman v. Miller is here as explicitly stated as it can be: "symbolism" as opposed to "logic, coherence and specificity;" "creation" as opposed to "higher order conceptual skills;" "the classroom of creation" as opposed to "the classroom of survival."

Smitherman calls to her aid, not Langer or Chomsky, but quite another sort of source for her position. She argues that the people who know best what they need from the composition classroom are the students themselves. "We need a philosophy of composition," she says, "which speaks to the question: why do this student need this course, which may be different from: why do I, the teacher, think he need it, but should be the same as: why do he, the student, think he need it?" This is an important assertion, it seems to me, and one which sharply distinguishes Smitherman and Miller. While Miller arrives at his conclusions from theoretical constructs concerning the nature of language, Smitherman arrives at hers from the notion that the composition course, above all, must be based on the felt needs of students themselves.

Based on her survey of expressed student need, Smitherman tells us quite specifically what the "classroom of survival" ought to do. She asks that the teacher of composition help students to acquire four "competencies"--which very word once again demonstrates the distinction between Smitherman and Miller. Smitherman asks that we teach the following:

1. "competence in obtaining information;"

2. "competence in reading," by which she means learning to make "...inferences and critically reacting to material read;"

3. "competence in using language as a conceptual tool," by which, she says, she means the "...cognitive function of language," and specifically rejects concern with the aesthetic use of language;

4. "Competency in organizing concepts into larger units of verbalization."

Smitherman concludes her discussion of these competencies by calling for an understanding that the composition course is a process course, which can be related to other areas of knowledge, "...cause, you see, the most commonly articulated need from Black students is that English teachers give them skills to write for other courses." Where Miller considers the composition course a Ding an sich, devoted to the fostering of the creative, liberating, enriching language experience, Smitherman, though in no way rejecting concern with the aesthetics of language, sees the composition course as a service designed mainly to help students do their work in other college courses more competently.

The "classroom of correction" is rejected by both our ideologies of composition"--so far they agree. But on the positive

side, that is, in attempting to define what the classroom ought to do, we are faced with contradictory positions. In practical terms, I find that the ten-week quarter, or even the two ten-week quarters of composition required of students at my university, are simply not long enough to teach the competencies Smitherman proposes, and at the same time, to devote the leisure, the thought, the talk, the experiencing necessary to learn to use language creatively, freely and in liberating ways, as Miller proposes. If, on the other hand, I were to make a choice for our entire composition program, and choose either of these approaches, the evidence presented by the two scholars makes it clear to me that some students will reject whichever choice I make as either "irrelevant" or else "mickey-mouse," and will feel that their needs have not been met.

Personally, I find myself in sympathy with both the "ideologies of composition" proposed, for different reasons. As a person who deals professionally not only with composition but, like so many of us, with fiction and poetry and drama as well, I am constantly involved with precisely the role for language which Miller discusses. Indeed, as a person with a vision of a genuinely liberated humanity, a vision much formed by Marx and his followers, and by such Marxist thinkers and artists as Erich Fromm, Antonio Gramsci, Walter Benjamin, Theodore Adorno and Bertolt Brecht, I find most attractive the notion that the teacher of composition can play a role in liberating the minds of his students from the shackles of an alienation imposed by a repressive society and its mores. As

Herbert Marcuse has pointed out,[5] even the language of the society fosters repression and alienation. If, then, I can help students by means of understanding the force of language, to liberate themselves further by extending the imagination into hitherto to them unknown realms of free and truly human activity, I am most gratified. The "classroom of creation," seems to me a tool towards such an end--and furthermore, the problems of pedagogy it presents are intrinsically fascinating.

On the other hand, as a person involved extensively in the political life of my community on a daily and on-going basis, and thus as a person in some contact with the needs and feelings of poor people and working people, whose children see college as means for escaping the welfare case worker or the steel mill foreman, I am also aware that some of our students need precisely to learn to use language as a tool for identifying certain restricted codes and for solving certain pressing cognitive problems. These students face a variety of life-tasks. They must get and hold jobs in management circles, or write speeches and platforms for local elections, or, for that matter, and for me of greater interest, figure out how to get the information for and then write a leaflet that will attack a discriminating or union-busting boss, or a Congress or a President who kills needed social legislation, or an oil company which helps to

support apartheid in South Africa. The "classroom of survival" seems to me a tool towards such ends--and, furthermore the problems of pedagogy it presents are also intrinsically fascinating. Survival and creation--these are the great human imperatives, and both can be reflected in an "ideology of composition." They will be in contradiction only because in any one given class, for any one given student with his or her own perceived needs, within a limited time span, both these useful approaches cannot be followed.

There is another dimension to this problem, a dimension that derives from the nature of the student body in modern American institutions of higher education. Surely we need no longer rehearse the fact that colleges, universities or junior colleges have become, in the last three decades or so, institutions asked to do many more things and to serve the needs of a much larger variety of students than ever before in their history. Where once one might assume, in most schools, a fairly homogeneous, essentially middle-class student body, we now have a most heterogeneous group of students to serve, diverse in terms of caste and class, ethnicity and previous education, goals and desires, and even in age. Such a variety of students exists not only among various institutions, but to one degree or another within each institution, be it junior college,

state University or elite academy. That fact, which we all acknouledge but on which we too infrequently act, makes all the difference. For I would argue that, in part at least, the distinction in goals between Smitherman and Miller is a distinction in goals dependent upon the social or economic class of the students served. Though there are certainly many exceptions among individual students, it is probable that the "classroom of creation" is more likely to be sought by middle-class students for whom the economic consequences of education are secondary, while the "classroom of survival" is more likely to be sought not only by Black and other ethnic minority students, but generally by students from poor and working-class backgrounds, for whom a college education is a way they hope will keep them out of the mill, the mine, the shop, the restaurant kitchen, or the secretarial pool.

One other component must be added to our consideration of an appropriate "ideology of composition." Miller deals extensively with Noam Chomsky's cogent attack on behaviorist psychology. Along with Chomsky, he rejects the principles of the behaviorists for establishing educational methodologies and goals. But in his very rejection--one which I largely share--Miller cites Chomsky's left-handed concession to the behaviorists ability to teach, and to know how to teach, a limited--and, he would add and I would agree--a limiting set of skills.

My point here is not to defend or attack behaviorism as such. The discussion of behaviorism in Miller's paper, however, and in Chomsky's work and elsewhere, which continues to go on so extensively,

does indicate that research in and an understanding of learning theory in general is very much in flux. We do not know what to teach and how to teach, in part because we have not yet sufficiently refined our understanding of the human mind to comprehend fully how people learn. The swings and the seeming faddishness, then, of theories of composition teaching and of other teaching as well, are not only the result of the vagaries of educators, but also the result of living in a time when we know enough to be aware that many of our educational procedures have failed, while we do not know enough to understand how to correct our failures.

My effort, then, to arrive at an honest, an appropriate, a useful "ideology of composition" is predicated on several postulates, as follows:

1. The "classroom of correction" is inadequate, and indeed harmful to the development of language skills for most students.

2. The nature of the contemporary student body in our schools is such that we may well expect, and do indeed find, a large variety of student-perceived educational needs, ranging from "liberation" and "creation" to "competency" and "survival," depending upon the reasons for which the student has subjected him or herself to the school experience.

3. Both the "classroom of creation" and the "classroom of survival" can be forms of liberating activities, though each can help to liberate human beings in different ways, and from different aspects of an oppressive and alienating social system.

4. Learning theory is in such a state of flux that it is

impossible to say that any one way of teaching, or any one set of approaches to teaching, is the way to teach any particular body of knowledge, set of skills, or means of apprehending and influencing experience, and all our teaching methods must therefore have about them something of the experimental and the tenuous, until we know much more about how human beings learn.

5. Both the "classroom of creation" and the "classroom of survival" are attractive and interesting to me, and therefore I assume, each, or both, will be interesting and attractive to a variety of teachers, given each teacher's bent, philosophy, background and training.

Given these postulates, then, can we choose between the "classroom of survival" and the "classroom of creation"? The answer is, I think, that no institutional "we" can decide, for the contemporary institutional "we" is too heterogeneous to make such a decision for all the students it encompasses. Each individual student, however, can make such a decision, I believe, based on his or her own reason for being in school. Our responsibility, as teachers of composition and as organizers of programs of composition, is to provide the largest possible variety of classrooms for our students. That is, the ideology of composition I espouse here is neither that of the "classroom of creation" nor that of the "classroom of survival" but one which encompasses both these classrooms, and all other varieties of classrooms of which we can conceive and, more important, which our students may desire--indeed a veritable cafeteria of available composition courses from which our students

can choose that which they feel will suit their particular appetites. The ideology I espouse is one of plenitude, for I contend that our students--and only our students--can be trusted to know, or at least in time to discover, what will satisfy their own needs from among the richest variety of possibilities. I find, then, that in the case of Smitherman v. Miller, or Miller v. Smitherman, neither is the plaintiff and neither the defendant, because both lay before us valid claims for the needs of different individual students, so that what the court ought to order is the availability of both these approaches, and yet others not here contemplated, for decision-making by those who must be the Supreme Court in all matters of educational decision-making--our students themselves.

We know that many a court decision is difficult to implement, be it one ordering the desegregation of schools, the turning over of tape recordings to an eager prosecutor, or, if I may be allowed my metaphor, the establishment of a widely varied program of composition. I am not impractical enough to think that I ask for something simple or easy to achieve. Such a concept as the composition cafeteria brings with it innumerable problems of administration and teaching procedure, and may well contain a number of serious pitfalls. I have neither the skills, nor here the time, to try to solve all these problems or to anticipate all possible pitfalls. If the concept of the composition cafeteria has any validity at all, its problems will certainly require and attract the attentions of a variety of minds, a variety of administrators, teachers and students, from a large variety of educational institutions. All I propose to

do here is to indicate briefly some problems I perceive, so that we can examine the concept of the composition cafeteria in reasonably realistic and reasonably pragmatic terms.

The first problem I perceive has to do with finding a variety of faculty to teach such a variety of courses that the concept of "cafeteria" is real, and not merely a pretense. In order to find such faculty, we will first of all have to write the most careful description of the teaching objectives of any particular class. We will have to find language that will tell teachers precisely what is expected of them--and what students can expect--in any given class: to teach a set of specific competencies; to provide opportunity for creative expression in non-fictional forms; to explore language as a creative means for the apprehension and recording of reality; to teach techniques of research and methods of recording research in logical, coherent fashion. Such descriptions and as many more as our imaginations and our understanding of writing can conjure up, and as the particular needs of our particular institutions require, will have to be written, and will then have to be detailed in the forms of sample syllabi and course outlines, so that a prospective teacher can know what is expected of him or her.

I envision here, it ought to be pointed out, a cafeteria based on several criteria, including the <u>aspect</u> of writing which is to be taught, rather than a cafeteria based only on the <u>subject matter</u> about which writing and discussion are to turn. On my own campus,

Prof. Irving Miller,[6] our director of composition until this year, lead in the development of composition classes using film, classes based on unified topics such as the ecology or women's problems, and other varieties of composition courses. This was a considerable advance and has worked very well. What I am proposing here, however, is, I believe, a step beyond subject-based and technique-based variations in composition teaching. The suggested cafeteria which derives from an examination of Smitherman v. Miller tells students and teachers not only that one can approach learning to write through a variety of subject matter, and through the examination of media other than print, but also that there are many kinds of writing activities to be learned, only some of which can be taught in one or two courses, and not all of which need be learned by all students. We will then have to see which of these skills our faculty members are prepared to teach and/or are competent to teach. If necessary we will have to train and retrain older and younger faculty, or even to hire faculty with particular skills to fill particular needs. That is, we will have to take the teaching of composition quite seriously, as seriously as we take American or British literature. We make damned sure that we have a Romantic person and a Colonial person and a Victorian person and a Renaissance person available to teach our literature courses. If we decide to follow the composition cafeteria concept, we will have to make sure that we have a competency person and a creative non-fiction person and a research techniques person, and several other such persons.

The other side of this problem has to do with letting our students know what to expect from any particular classroom, so that they can make a choice based on their perception of their own educational needs. Again, catalog and time-table copy will be crucial here, as will proper and serious student advising. Furthermore, the whole concept of such a composition program, and the relationship between various classes and the possible variety of educational goals each class might help to accomplish, must be made clear to our students, so that, like the informed electorate which the democratic process always posits, they can make a genuine choice, based on their own--I almost hesitate to say it--enlightened self-interest.

A subset of this problem has to do with the student who changes his or her mind about the course chosen. I have said that the classroom of creation is more likely to be chosen by middle class students, and the classroom of survival is more likely to be chosen by students from poor and working class backgrounds. But that is surely not an invariable rule. In each of these groups there will be those who will not fit the expected pattern. The student maverick who doesn't fit any pattern expected of him or her is one of the delights of most teachers, is often the one possessing the unusual, the original mind, contact with which is one of the greatest emoluments of teaching. The last thing we would want the composition cafeteria to become is a means of tracking students into roles set for them a priori on the basis of class, ethnicity, or background, roles set by a society they did

not make. Such tracking was an insidious by-product of the late and unlamented military draft, and is often the effect of educational grouping in the elementary and high schools, and is a way of keeping people "in their place"--read, from rocking the boat in which the social system has set them toiling at the oars. Furthermore, as we should by now have learned from the women's movement, and from the liberation movements of Black people and other ethnic minorities, socialization in an oppressive society often leads people to have self-images which make it difficult to move out of prescribed tracks, so that they track themselves in docility and submission into roles which they might well not desire at all, given a truly free choice. All these factors, plus the experience we have all had with general student indecision and uncertainty, make it absolutely essential that there be plenty of opportunity for students to change their minds about a composition course they have chosen.

This will mean mechanisms in which students can change their composition classes as late in the quarter or semester or trimester as possible, while still profiting from instruction. It will make it important to let students drop courses, without prejudice or adverse effect on grade point averages and other academic measuring devices, with much greater liberality than is the usual case. It will mean that we must emphasize learning as far more important than grading, teaching towards achievement as more important than measurements of success.

Finally, we will have to find means of testing and checking the utility of the composition cafeteria. While we may reject the

behaviorist emphasis on quantifying all knowledge, we will have to find ways of discovering, quantitatively or qualitatively, or even by nothing more impressive than the most careful observation, if our students are getting from their composition courses what they need and want. Not only will we have to make this judgment on the basis of the student's continued life in the educational institution, but we will also want to see if whatever it is the student has obtained in the classroom he or she has chosen is useful in some life sense, some sense that leads to activity beyond the campus, to activity in the business of being citizens, lovers, parents, workers, revolutionaries, radicals, conservatives, artists, thinkers, dreamers, feelers, consumers, writers and talkers--all those activities of life for which, after all, the educational institution is to be a preparation, and on which the composition classroom may have some effect.

I foresee, then, many problems in establishing the composition cafeteria, but I also think that only with some such approach can we make valid the assertion that composition is important, is worth the spending of scarce educational resources, worthy of pursuit by teachers who claim to be rendering a service to their communities through their profession, and, most important, worth our students' time, effort and money.

The composition cafeteria should help to end the elitism and middle-class bias which has often been characteristic of the composition course, and which often makes working-class and minority students feel that composition is a stumbling block on their way to

an education, rather than a useful and important learning experience.

Such an approach should help to end the frustration of teachers who have ideas about how composition ought to be taught--ideas as varied as Smitherman's or Miller's--because there ought to be room for all varieties of composition teaching in the cafeteria. Such an approach should end any tendency towards the classroom of correction, because it will require the spelling out, if not of behavioral, then surely of educational objectives not only for the composition program of any particular campus, but for each and every single composition course, be they liberating objectives or survival objectives, creative objectives or competency-learning objectives, or some combination and integration of these objectives.

Such a program ought to help end the crisis in composition teaching, described once again and in detail in Ron Smith's recent survey of composition programs in four year colleges,[7] because it ought to make composition for our students not something of which they are afraid but something to which they look with interest, because they will be in a position to exercise the right to determine their own educational objectives, in ways which appear useful to them. Ultimately, I think we all know that composition programs will live or die not because of administrators, faculty senates, English departments or state legislators. They will live or die because students will decide that they want them or don't want them, can use them or can't use them. Nothing can be clearer in the age of the FTE and the dying foreign language requirement.

It seems to me, finally, that the composition cafeteria is a

necessary development because it is congruent with the facts of University, college and junior college life in our time. It acknowledges by its very existence the huge variety of educational needs, educational objectives, and socially useful functions which the institution of higher education is asked to perform. It caters, as we should cater, to a variety of felt student needs and to a variety of future life-objectives. It makes available different programs for the felt needs of minority students and working-class students, mavericks and misfits, experimental school products and ghetto school products and prep school products, all of whom can hopefully find in an available cafeteria of composition something that will be both nourishing and appetizing. Different strokes, the cafeteria suggests, for different folks. Furthermore, the cafeteria makes possible a variety of teaching approaches and teaching styles, at a time when we must all continue to discover how to teach by experimentation, because we have no final answers as to how people learn best, or even as to what it is that people need to know in order to become proficient writers and communicators, or creative users of language. In brief, the composition cafeteria seems to me to democratize and to open up the composition program in ways it needs very badly.

Thus I conclude argument in the case of Miller v. Smitherman, or Smitherman v. Miller, hoping to have reached an out of court settlement which includes the two opposites in a more inclusive unity.

NOTES

[1] I am grateful to Prof. James E. Miller, Jr. for supplying me with a copy of his paper, which has not, to my knowledge, been published at this writing. All italics are Prof. Miller's.

[2] I am grateful to Prof. Geneva Smitherman for supplying me with a copy of her paper which has not, to my knowledge, been published at this writing. All emphases are hers.

[3] Miller is here quoting from Noam Chomsky's Language and Mind, p. 101.

[4] James E. Miller, Jr., World, Self, Reality: The Rhetoric of Imagination (New York: Dodd, Mead & Co., 1971).

[5] See e.g. Herbert Marcuse, One-Dimensional Man (Boston: Beacon Press, 1964), chapters, 3, 4, et passim.

[6] I wish to thank Prof. Irving Miller of the University of Illinois at Chicago Circle for his wise and thoughtful reading of an earlier version of this ms. Of course, the usual disclaimer concerning any responsibility on his part for the work's faults, applies.

[7] Ron Smith, "The Composition Requirement Today: A Report on a Nationwide Survey of Four-Year Colleges and Universities," College Communication and Composition, 5 (1974), 138-48.